

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,244	01/26/2004	Pierre H. Turpin	CLON-107	1759
24353 7:	24353 7590 07/31/2006		EXAMINER	
•	FIELD & FRANCIS	KETTER, JAMES S		
SUITE 200	1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE SUITE 200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EAST PALO A	ALTO, CA 94303		1636	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/765,244	TURPIN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		James S. Ketter	1636			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	☑ Claim(s) <u>30-50</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>30-50</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) <u>34 and 35</u> is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)🛛	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 January 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1636

This application contains claims 30 and 37-50 drawn in part to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 4 January 2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected subject matter or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

It is noted that on 13 July 2006 an IDS with at least three references was filed with the USPTO. However, for reasons not presently clear, the images of those documents have not been scanned into the IFW system. Consequently, the IDS in question has not yet been considered. Applicants are advised to check on PAIR or contact the Examiner after a week or two to determine if the scanning has been completed, so that the IDS may be considered.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 30-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lukyanov et al. for reasons of record set forth in the Office Action mailed 10 February 2006.

Applicants argue, at the second and third pages of the remarks filed 10 May 2006, that Lukyanov et al. does not teach the claimed sensitivity element. However, this is not clear for several reasons. First, it is not clear what element is being recited in the claims. The claim recites that the recited fusion protein is at least 4 times more sensitive than a fusion protein that

includes a d1 protein degradation domain. However, as set forth in the rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, below, the claim does not exclude d1-containing embodiments, and thus appears to be making a comparison to itself, in part, i.e., for some of its own embodiments. Second, since Lukyanov et al. teaches the same components of the fusion protein, the resulting fusion protein taught therein would inherently have the higher sensitivity recited. Third, it is not clear how "sensitivity" is determined for the present invention. As such, it is not apparent what the recited comparison actually excludes.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30, and therefore claims 31-50 dependent therefrom, recites "4 times more sensitive". However, it is not clear how sensitivity is measured, e.g., strength of signal, time to achieve a particular level of signal intensity, signal-to-noise ratio, etc. The specification does not set forth how this is determined. As such, the metes and bounds of the instant claims are unclear.

Claim 30, and therefore claims 31-50 which depend therefrom, recites a comparison to a fusion protein that includes a d1 protein degradation domain. However, it appears that the instant claims encompass embodiments which comprise the d1 domain, and as such, the claimed invention is being compared to itself, which renders unclear its metes and bounds.

Art Unit: 1636

Claim 34, and therefore claim 35 which depends therefrom, is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "N-ter" should be spelled out for clarity. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Ketter whose telephone number is 571-272-0770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,244 Page 5

Art Unit: 1636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSK 21 July 2006

JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER